

3. The type species of *Acrida* was designated in Opinion 299 (1954) as *Gryllus turritus* Linnaeus, 1758. The type species of *Acrydium* (= *Acridium*) is *Gryllus stridulus* Linnaeus, 1758, so it is a senior objective synonym of *Psophus* Fieber, 1853, as pointed out by Kerzhner (BZN 46: 42). *Psophus* is in use; it was placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Opinion 149 (1943) but its synonymy with *Acrydium* was not then dealt with by the suppression of the latter. *Acrida* and *Acrydium*/*Acridium* (i.e. *Psophus*) are entirely distinct and it is unfortunate that the names resemble each other.

4. Complications concerning various family-group names have delayed the disposal of Key's application (BZN 45: 191–193). As discussed in the preceding comments it is very desirable to settle finally the status of the 59 generic names erected by Geoffroy (1762). If the applications of Kerzhner and Borowiec are approved *Acrydium* will be the only remaining Geoffroy name (cf. Kerzhner's para. D.1 on BZN 48: 112). Its suppression is therefore proposed below, as is that of *Acridium* Schaeffer, 1766. Key (para. 7 on BZN 45: 192) has proposed the suppression of both generic names, but gave their authorships as Müller, 1764 and 1776 respectively. If Proposal (1) on BZN 49: 226 is not approved *Acrydium* could be taken from Geoffroy in Müller, 1764 or Schluga, 1767 (see para. 2 above). There is of course no need to place *Acrida* and *Psophus* on the Official List.

5. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

- (1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the following generic names for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy:
 - (a) *Acrydium* Geoffroy, 1762;
 - (b) *Acridium* Schaeffer, 1766;
- (2) to place the following names on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology:
 - (a) *Acrydium* Geoffroy, 1762, as suppressed in (1)(a) above;
 - (b) *Acridium* Schaeffer, 1766, as suppressed in (1)(b) above.

Additional references

- Geoffroy, E.L. 1762. *Histoire abrégée des insectes qui se trouvent aux environs de Paris*. Vol. 1, xxviii, 523 pp. Vol. 2, 690 pp. Durand, Paris.
- Schaeffer, J.C. 1766. *Elementa entomologica*. 168 pp., 133 pls. Weiss, Ratisbonae.
- Schluga, J.B. 1767. *Primae lineae cognitionis insectorum cum figuris aeneis*. 1, 47, 4 pp., 2 pls. Kraus, Vienna.

Comments on the proposed conservation of the names *Lincus* Stål, 1867 and *croupius* Rolston, 1983 (Insecta, Heteroptera)
(Case 2798; see BZN 49: 19–21)

(1) L.B. Holthuis

Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, Postbus 9157, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

The arguments to save the well-known name *Lincus* for a genus of Heteroptera that is important in phytopathology are convincing. However, I see no reason to suppress

the specific name *bipunctata* Spinola, 1850 in favour of *croupius* Rolston, 1983. It seems a great advantage to accept the 133-year older name for the species; this gives more nomenclatural stability as any overlooked synonym published since 1850 cannot do any harm. Therefore, I suggest the rejection of proposals (1)(b) and (5) on BZN 49: 20, and the substitution of *bipunctata* for *croupius* in proposal (3)(b).

(2) L.H. Rolston

Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803-1710, U.S.A.

In response to the above objection by Holthuis to the suppression of the specific name *bipunctata* Spinola, 1850 and the placement of *croupius* Rolston, 1983 on the Official List of Specific Names, it appears to me that nomenclatural stability would be served best by suppressing a name used once and only once in primary literature and conserving the synonym that has been used in applied work by seven authors, in addition to my 1983 paper. There is a manuscript in press by two additional authors (G. Couturier & F. Kahn) that also uses the specific name *croupius*. This name has thus been used by at least 10 authors in 6 papers since 1983. Perhaps it is unfortunate that I am the author of the specific name proposed as an addition to the Official List. I am not biased because of authorship and shall not be in the least perturbed on personal grounds should the proposal be rejected.

Comments on the proposed conservation of the generic name *Helophorus* Fabricius, 1775 (Insecta, Coleoptera) as the correct original spelling

(Case 2796; see BZN 49: 30-31)

(1) A. Smetana

Centre for Land and Biological Resources Research, Biological Division, Agriculture Canada, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C6, Canada

I am in full support of the application by R.B. Angus to conserve the name *Helophorus*.

Angus correctly states that Illiger's emendation of the original Fabricius spelling of *Elophorus* to *Helophorus* is unjustified under Article 33b of the Code. However, the fact that the overwhelming majority of authors, both old and recent, used Illiger's spelling *Helophorus* should be taken into consideration. I would like to emphasize here that the spelling *Helophorus* is used in the recent and comprehensive treatment of the genera of hydrophiloid beetles by Hansen (1991); this will be used as the standard reference for many years to come. The spelling *Helophorus* is used consistently also in many recent non-taxonomic papers in the fields of palaeontology (e.g. Schwert, 1992), ecology (Koch, 1989) and economic entomology (Booth, Cox & Madge, 1990), and in recent catalogues and checklists (e.g. Lucht, 1987; Roughley, 1991).

A return to the original Fabricius spelling *Elophorus* would certainly not contribute to the stability of nomenclature.